



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/429,419	10/28/1999	PAUL J. SMALSER	OPT-32U	5909

7590 03/28/2002

MICHAEL Y EPSTEIN
387 KING ST.
STE. H
CHARLESTON, SC 29403

EXAMINER	
GONZALEZ, JULIO C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/429,419	SMALSER ET AL.
	Examiner Julio C. Gonzalez	Art Unit 2834

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- The period for reply is open-ended, the normal statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2002.
- This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- Claim(s) 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 - Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 - Claim(s) 9-20 is/are rejected.
 - Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 - Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - All
 - Some *
 - None of:
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In page 6, the work "stoke". Appropriate correction is required.
2. In page 4, applicant discloses that the "natural energy conversion efficiency can easily be a factor of ten". What is this factor compared to? Was it calculated? How?

Applicant is required to provide a clarification of these matters or correlation with art-accepted terminology so that a proper comparison with the prior art can be made. Applicant should be careful not to introduce any new matter into the disclosure (i.e., matter which is not supported by the disclosure as originally filed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

What composes the collecting mechanism? The load since it absorbs energy or the motor 14? Is the energy collected in a device?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syverson in view of Mikhail et al.

Syverson discloses an operating system for generating electrical power for a source of input energy occurring at variable rates including a first rate at which the energy is safely captured and at a second rate which is captured by varying the impedance of the load for increasing the output current from the generator for increasing the mechanical impedance of the generator (column 5, lines 31-37, see also figures 5 and 8).

However, Syverson does not disclose explicitly that the generator's mechanical impedance is controlled.

On the other hand, Mikhail et al discloses, explicitly, for the purpose of providing a stable turbine system that the generator mechanical impedance is controlled (column 5, lines 35-42).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design a operating system for a generating system as disclosed by Syverson and to modify the invention by directly controlling the generator for the purpose of providing a stable turbine system as disclosed by Mikhail et al.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
8. Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Syverson discloses that the generator's speed is varied (column 5, lines 32-38). Anybody with ordinary skill in the art would know that by varying the speed of the generator, the impedance of the generator is varied, too. Also, the current of the generator is sensed (column 6, lines 60-65) and reduced in the generator (column 6, lines 47-51 & column 9, lines 18-25). Moreover, the generator is slowed when needed (column 5, lines 38-40 & column 7, lines 19-22). Also, the generator is disclosed to continuously run since the shut down feature can be applied if desired (column 5, line 48). Syverson discloses using a load to slow the speed of the generator by controlling the current (column 6, lines 10, 38-42). Also, a device for sensing the speed of the generator is disclosed (column 6, lines 60-66).

Also, according to the Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, continuous means uninterrupted in time. How long is continuous? Claims of applicant's invention are not specific enough. Syverson discloses that the invention disclosed can run up to thirty minutes (column 8, lines 28-38) or to a desired time. The claims do not disclose specifically how continuous is the invention or for how long can the applicant's invention run. Moreover, Syverson discloses that the device is able to run for over extended period of times (see abstract).

9. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., continued operation of the system, the braking been applied in proportion to a sensed variable parameter) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julio C. Gonzalez whose telephone number is (703) 305-1563. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8AM-5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Jcg

March 25, 2002

Thomas M. Dougherty
THOMAS M. DOUGHERTY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100
28-00